

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

THOMAS A. WEBER,

Plaintiff,

v.

TIME WARNER, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C05-1706L

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. #118) of this Court's January 31, 2006 order denying his motion to compel defendants to produce their initial disclosures (Dkt. #110, the "Order").

Plaintiff now alleges that defendants' initial disclosures were incomplete, and requests that the Court compel them to provide complete initial disclosures. A request for new relief is not appropriate in a motion for reconsideration.

Plaintiff also requests that the Court reconsider the portion of the Order imposing \$500.00 in sanctions against him. Plaintiff correctly notes that the Order erroneously stated that plaintiff filed his motion on January 12, 2006, when in fact he mailed it on January 9, 2006. Therefore, the Order incorrectly stated that plaintiff filed a motion to compel production of initial disclosures after he had already received them, which occurred on January 10, 2006.

1 However, the award of sanctions was also based on the fact that plaintiff failed to withdraw his  
2 motion after acknowledging that he had received the initial disclosures.

3 Plaintiff does not dispute that he never withdrew his motion after receiving the initial  
4 disclosures. Instead, he argues that he did not withdraw the motion because the disclosures were  
5 incomplete. Plaintiff, however, did not file a reply in support of his motion to notify the Court  
6 of his changed request.<sup>1</sup> Nor did he confer with defendants regarding the allegedly incomplete  
7 disclosures as required by the Court's rules.

8 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

9  
10 DATED this 17th day of February, 2006.

11  
12  
13 

14 Robert S. Lasnik  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> Instead of filing a reply, plaintiff filed two "notices" which did not comply with the  
26 Court's rules. Local Rules 7(d)(2), 10(e)(2). Plaintiff's "notice regarding motion to compel  
27 discovery" (Dkt. #106) incorrectly noted that defendants had not responded to the motion, and  
28 failed to state that defendants had already served their initial disclosures.